

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability of claim 8. Claim 8 remains as the only independent claim. Claim 5, an elected claim is dependent upon claim 8. The deletions from claim 5 avoid duplication of elements already introduced in claim 8. Accordingly, claims 8, 5 and 6 remain. It is submitted that they are allowable.

In the Office Action, claim 7, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over two references. With the cancellation of claim 7 and the Amendment of claims 5 and 6 to be dependent upon allowable claim 8, it is submitted that previously rejected claims 5 and 6 are allowable. Accordingly, allowance of claims 8, 5 and 6 is requested.

Entry of this Amendment after Final Office Action is requested. Claim 8 was allowed. Claims 5 and 6 are as previously presented, just made dependent on claim 8. It is believed this change raises no new issue and entry of this Amendment and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON APRIL 11, 2008.



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:mjw